			1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2	X		
3			
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :	16-CV-7057 (KAM)	
5	Plaintiff, : :	U.S. Courthouse Brooklyn, New York	
6	-against-	TRANSCRIPT OF PREMOTION CONFERENCE	
7	-aga ms c -	TREMOTION CONFERENCE	
8		April 7, 2017	
9	BARCLAYS CAPITAL, INC.,	10:30 a.m.	
10	ET AL,		
11	Defendants. : X		
12	BEFORE:		
13	HONORABLE KIYO A. MATSUMOTO, U.S.D.J.		
14		Γ M. ROHDE, ESQ. United States Attorney	
15	271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: F. FRANKLIN AMANAT, ESQ. CHARLES S. KLEINBERG, ESQ. KATHARINE E.G. BROOKER, ESQ. EVAN P. LESTELLE, ESQ. MATTHEW R. BELZ, ESQ. Assistant U.S. Attorneys		
16			
17			
18			
19		orotalic o.o. Accorneys	
20	For the Barclays		
21	defendants: SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004		
22		AREN PATTON SEYMOUR, ESQ.	
23			
24	WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP 725 Twelfth Street, NW		
25	Washington, DC 20005 BY: KANNON K. SHANMUGAM, ESQ.		

		2	
1	For Defendant		
2	Menefee: KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP 1177 Avenue of the Americas		
3	New York, NY 10036 BY: DANI R. JAMES, ESQ.		
4			
5	For Defendant Carroll: Crowell & Moring LLP		
6	590 Madison Avenue, 20th Fl. New York, NY 10022		
7	BY: GLEN G. McGORTY, ESQ.		
8			
9			
10	Court Reporter: Holly Driscoll, CSR Official Court Reporter 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201		
11			
12	(718) 613-2274		
13	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by Computer-Assisted Transcript.		
14			
15	* * *		
16			
17	TUE CLEDY. This is sivil promotion bearing		
18 19	THE CLERK: This is civil premotion hearing,		
20	16-CV-7057, United States of America versus Barclays Capital, Inc., et al.		
21	Please counsel for plaintiff state your appearances		
22	and the entity that you're representing.		
23	MR. AMANAT: Frank Amanat from the United States		
24	Attorney's Office on behalf of the United States of America.		
25	THE COURT: Good morning.		
	·		

3 1 MS. SEYMOUR: Thank you, Your Honor, good morning, 2 Karen Seymour from Sullivan & Cromwell on behalf of the 3 Barclays defendants and I'm here with my co-counsel who will 4 also state his appearance. THE COURT: All right, thank you. Good morning. 5 MR. SHANMUGAM: Kannon Shanmugam of Williams & 6 7 Connolly also for the Barclays defendants. 8 THE COURT: All right, thank you. 9 Who will be speaking on behalf of Barclays this 10 morning, both? MS. SEYMOUR: Your Honor, both of us may; in terms 11 12 of the substance of the motion, Mr. Shanmugam would be arguing 13 the motion, if there is a hearing on it ultimately we would 14 ask him to address those issues. 15 THE COURT: Great, thank you. MS. JAMES: Good morning, Your Honor, Dani James 16 17 from Kramer Levin on behalf of Mr. Menefee. 18 THE COURT: Good morning. 19 MR. MCGORTY: Good morning, Glen McGorty from 20 Crowell Moring on behalf of Mr. Carroll. 21 Good morning. Nice to see you again. THE COURT: 22 All right, counsel, I scheduled this primarily just 23 to talk to you about the motion. You want to make a 12(b)(6) 24 motion, correct, and one I think group of defendants wants to 25 challenge personal jurisdiction?

I will say that this complaint is probably one of more fulsome complaints I've ever seen, it's nearly two hundred pages and, as the government points out in its opposing letter, it is really detailed in terms of setting out tables and charts including particular transactions and statements that they are alleging are fraudulent.

I don't know whether your clients' best interest would be served by engaging in motion practice or whether your clients might be better served collectively to go to mediation or appear before Judge Mann, I think it is Judge Mann in this case, to try to resolve the matter. I don't want to hear argument today about the substance of the motions, I've read your letters but I'll hear from the parties if they want to be heard further about whether the only thing to do at this point is just on scheduling the motions. It seems to me you're in agreement about the scheduling.

MS. SEYMOUR: Your Honor, we are in agreement on the scheduling and it is our belief that our client would be well served by the motion. We hear what Your Honor observes about certainly the weight and length and the number of allegations but we do think there are some issues with the way that the complaint was pled in terms of the linking of many of those statements in the back of the appendices to the actual alleged fraud and the scheme and we think there's some defects also with the application of FIRREA here, so we would like to

5

proceed to the motion if the Court will allow it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, I'm never going to preclude anyone from making a motion but I will tell you that I've got to assume for purposes of deciding your motions that all the facts pled are true if they're well pled, as you know. There was some argument in some of the letters that seemed to suggest that they were making trial arguments rather than arguments about the sufficiency of the pleadings and I guess one question I had was whether, based on the defense view of the deficiencies in the pleadings, whether it would make sense to allow the government to address those alleged deficiencies by amending. I'm not encouraging the government to make the complaint more lengthy but perhaps to add additional detail if they felt it was worthwhile or whether they wish to stand on the current complaint. The Second Circuit generally does counsel courts to allow an amendment in any event if I do find that the pleading is deficient.

So, I'm happy hear from the government on a possible amendment in lieu of motion practice and whether that might address the defense concerns or whether you're going to stand on the complaint.

MR. AMANAT: Well, Your Honor, yes, Frank Amanat on behalf of the government; at the present time we do not believe there's a basis based on the premotion conference letters submitted by the defendants to amend the complaint.

Obviously if they proceed with their motion, when we get their brief and see their arguments more fleshed out if there's a basis to amend the complaint or if that's a way that is in the government's interest to do that that appears from their brief, we will contemplate doing that but we agree with the Court, Your Honor, that the motion practice that the defendants are proposing to engage in likely will serve very little purpose. We don't believe that their arguments as set forth in their premotion conference letters have any merit but, of course, they will make the motion that they will make.

THE COURT: All right. Let me just ask the parties collectively what about the option of exploring settlement before you launch into motion practice, is there a reason why you would be opposed to doing that?

MR. AMANAT: Well, Your Honor, I can tell the Court that before we filed the case we engaged with at least the corporate defendants in almost seven months of settlement negotiations and spent an extended period of time exploring all avenues and we ended up still pretty far apart which is how we got here today. I've already communicated to counsel for the defendants that the government stands ready to resume settlement negotiations at any time if the defendants come forward and indicate that they are interested in resuming those discussions, I have not received a response from defendants at this point in time.

7 In the meantime, our plan is to go forward with 1 2 discovery and get the case ready to go to trial. 3 expectation is that at some point in time we do expect that 4 the defendants will come back to us and say let's talk some 5 more. 6 THE COURT: Ms. Seymour. MS. SEYMOUR: Yes, Your Honor, we would be happy to 7 talk to the government, of course, but prior efforts have not 8 9 been successful and at this point it was our strategy to move 10 forward with the motion, we think that will best serve our 11 clients' interest, but we're always willing to try again and 12 to talk but our preference at this stage would be to move 13 forward, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Well, it appears that the defendants want 65 pages to brief this issue, the individual 15 16 defendants want 30 pages; is that correct? 17 MS. JAMES: Yes, Your Honor. 18 MR. MCGORTY: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: And the government is asking for 125 20 pages and I understand you're going to have multiple motions 21 to defend. 22 MR. AMANAT: Right. 23 THE COURT: But isn't it possible that the arguments 24 raised by some of the defendants will be overlapping so you 25 don't need to repeat them twice or three times?

8 Of course, we anticipate submitting one 1 MR. AMANAT: 2 consolidated brief that will respond collectively to the 3 defendants' arguments and so, of course, if an argument is 4 made by more than one defendant, we'll just respond to it once in a consolidated brief. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. What I would appreciate though on the government's end, your letter was very helpful 7 8 but I would appreciate citations to the paragraphs of your 9 complaint or the tables when you are defending the sufficiency 10 of your pleadings. 11 Absolutely, yes, Your Honor. MR. AMANAT: 12 So I don't have to go looking through THE COURT: 13 200 pages to find it --14 MR. AMANAT: Understood. THE COURT: -- and hope that it is there. 15 16 MR. AMANAT: Of course. 17 THE COURT: And certainly if the defendants are able 18 to cite to anything in the complaint that they think is not 19 sufficient, I'd appreciate being able to read those references

to the complaint or the tables.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess I am having trouble understanding how it is in your clients' best interest to proceed with this motion but I leave it to you to make that decision and I'm sure you've spoken to your client and they are aware of the standards for pleading and the fact that I do have to consider as true the

9 allegations in the complaint in deciding this motion. 1 2 MR. SHANMUGAM: Your Honor, could I say just one 3 thing on that point? 4 THE COURT: Yes. sir. Obviously some of the arguments 5 MR. SHANMUGAM: 6 we're planning to make in the motion are traditional arguments 7 concerning the sufficiency of the allegations but, as Your 8 Honor will be aware from the letters, there are some 9 profoundly significant legal issues and, in particular, issues 10 concerning the government's use of FIRREA that we respectfully 11 submit is going to be very important to resolve at the 12 threshold here and, in particular, the government's theories 13 concerning the predicate offenses and the predicate offenses 14 of mail wire and bank fraud in particular, those are deficiencies that obviously cannot be cured by any amendment 15 16 in our view and therefore those legal arguments are, again, arguments that in our view are going to be very important to 17 18 resolve at this stage. 19 THE COURT: All right. So, what is your proposed 20 schedule for the defense to serve but not file their briefs? 21 I, as you know, observe the bundling rule and I would 22 appreciate getting two courtesy copies as you serve but 23 nothing should hit the docket until it is fully briefed. 24 MR. AMANAT: Fair enough, yes, ma'am, the parties'

agreement, Your Honor, was that the defendants would serve

25

10 1 their briefs on the government two weeks from today which 2 would be April 21, the government would then have 90 days to 3 serve its opposition which would take us I believe to July 21, 4 and then the defendants would then have 45 days after that to serve their reply briefs which I don't know what date that is. 5 MS. SEYMOUR: Your Honor, I think on the dates it is 6 7 July 20th and September 5th. 8 MR. AMANAT: July 20th and September 5th, there we 9 are. 10 THE COURT: All right. I don't want to hear any letters about Labor Day and we need more time, right, you've 11 12 got plenty of time. 13 MS. SEYMOUR: We'll be set, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Okay, good. All right. So, please, again, remember to deliver two courtesy copies as you serve 15 your adversaries with your documents and I'll look forward to 16 17 reading your briefs. Thank you. 18 MS. SEYMOUR: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 MR. AMANAT: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 MR. KLEINBERG: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 (Time noted: 10:50 a.m.) 22 (End of proceedings.) 23 24 25